

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 5 and 16 remain cancelled. Thus, claims 1-4, 6-15, and 17-28 are present for examination.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the indication that claims 25-27 are allowed.

Applicant expresses further appreciation to the Examiner for the indication that claims 9, 10, 20, and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Teleconference with Examiner:

Attorney for Applicant, Mr. Sobaje, called Examiner Wang on November 7, 2006, to discuss the objections to the drawings and specification listed in the present Office Action. During the telephone conversation, Mr. Sobaje explained that applicant has already previously submitted the drawing and specification changes requested by the Examiner. In particular, Mr. Sobaje pointed to the submissions of the drawings and specification listed in PAIR for February 22, 2005, which include the requested changes.

The Examiner agreed that the drawings and specification have already been updated, and stated that applicant should just make note of the already filed drawings and specification in the reply to the present Office Action.

Drawings:

The drawings are objected to because in Figs. 1, 2, and 8, "LAKE CCT." should be ---RAKE CCT. ---, respectively.

The objection is respectfully traversed.

The drawing changes requested by the Examiner have already previously been made in the response listed on PAIR for February 22, 2005.

Specification:

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: (i) on pages 1-2, “lake circuit 140” should be changed to --- rake circuit 140 ---; and (ii) on pages 7, 8, 10, and 11, “lake circuit 40” should be changed to --- rake circuit 40 ---.

The objection is respectfully traversed.

The specification changes requested by the Examiner have already previously been made in the response listed on PAIR for February 22, 2005.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1-4, 8, 11-15, 19, 22-24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takagi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,682) (hereinafter Takagi).

Claims 6, 7, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi in view of Ishikura (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,684).

With respect to claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-15, 17-19, 22-24, and 28, as amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a receiving terminal for a CDMA system, comprising:

“a plurality of finger circuit elements, each of said plurality of finger circuit elements for making a correlation between a received signal from a radio circuit connected to an antenna and a known signal and for outputting a correlated received signal as a result of the correlation; and

a rake circuit for combining the correlated received signals output from the plurality of finger circuit elements to provide a synthesized received signal;

wherein the rake circuit is configured to execute electric field level judgment based on the correlated received signals output from the plurality of finger circuit elements and a predetermined threshold level;

wherein the rake circuit is configured to **obtain a difference** between (i) **a particular electric field level** of a particular correlated received signal output from **a particular finger circuit element** of the plurality of finger circuit elements and (ii) **a certain electric field level** of a certain correlated received signal output from **a certain finger circuit element** of the plurality of finger circuit elements, and is configured to **compare the difference with the predetermined threshold level** as part of the electric field level judgment; and

wherein an operation of at least one finger circuit element of the plurality of finger circuit elements can be suspended for a fixed, predetermined time period according to a result of the electric field level judgment.” (Emphasis Added).

A receiving terminal for a CDMA system including the above-quoted features has at least the advantages that: (a) a rake circuit is configured to **obtain a difference** between (i) **a particular electric field level** of a particular correlated received signal output from **a particular finger circuit element** of a plurality of finger circuit elements and (ii) **a certain electric field level** of a certain correlated received signal output from **a certain finger circuit element** of the plurality of finger circuit elements; (b) the rake circuit is configured to **compare the difference with a predetermined threshold level** as part of an electric field level judgment; and (c) an operation of at least one finger circuit element of the plurality of finger circuit elements can be suspended for a fixed, predetermined time period according to a result of the

electric field level judgment. (Specification as Filed; page 12, line 3 – page 13, line 14; Figs. 1, 2, 5A, 5B, and 7).

Takagi neither discloses nor suggests a receiving terminal for a CDMA system including the above-quoted features with a rake circuit that is configured to obtain a difference between (i) a particular electric field level of a particular correlated received signal output from a particular finger circuit element of a plurality of finger circuit elements and (ii) a certain electric field level of a certain correlated received signal output from a certain finger circuit element of the plurality of finger circuit elements, and is configured to compare the difference with a predetermined threshold level as part of an electric field level judgment.

In the system of Takagi, only correlated outputs from correlators are compared with a threshold value. (Takagi; abstract; Figs. 1A, 8, 9, and 6; col. 7, line 45 – col. 8, line 23). The system of Takagi does not obtain a difference between (i) a particular receiving level of a signal output from a particular finger circuit element and (ii) a certain receiving level of a signal output from a certain finger circuit element and then compare the difference with a threshold level. (Takagi; abstract; Figs. 1A, 8, 9, and 6; col. 7, line 45 – col. 8, line 23). Comparing a receiving level of a single signal with a threshold value as in Takagi is not the same as comparing a difference between receiving levels of two signals with a threshold value.

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Takagi reference and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 11 recites a receiving terminal for a CDMA system with features similar to features of a receiving terminal for a CDMA system of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 12 recites a receiver with features similar to features of a receiving terminal for a CDMA system of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 22 recites a receiver with features similar to features of a receiving terminal for a CDMA system of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 23 recites a receiving method for a CDMA system with features similar to features of a receiving terminal for a CDMA system of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 24 recites a receiving method with features similar to features of a receiving terminal for a CDMA system of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend. With regard to dependent claims 6, 7, 17, and 18, it is noted that Ishikura does not cure the deficiencies with respect to the teaching of Takagi discussed above. Thus, the Patent Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 15, 2006

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (310) 975-7965
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Justin M. Sobaje
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,252